

Illinois U Library

September 30, 1952
734th BROADCAST

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 300 Stations of the ABC Radio Network

U. S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.



Why Change?

Moderator, JAMES F. MURRAY, JR.

Speakers

MRS. INDIA EDWARDS

MRS. OSWALD B. LORD



COMING

—October 14, 1952—

Is Today's Prosperity Real?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 36, N. Y.

VOLUME 18, NUMBER 20



\$5.00 A YEAR, 15c A COPY

Town Meeting

Vol. 18

No. 20



Why Change?

The Broadcast of September 30, 1952, from 9:00 to 9:45 p.m., E.S.T., over the American Broadcasting Company Radio Network, originated from Town Hall, New York City.

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of views presented.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

MRS. OSWALD B. LORD—Co-chairman, National Committee, Citizens for Eisenhower. Long known as a civic and welfare worker, Mrs. Lord has had wide experience in organizational work. She was born in Minneapolis in 1904 and graduated from Smith College in 1927. Returning to Minnesota, she started in doing volunteer family welfare work. In 1929 she married and moved to New York City where she not only raised two sons but continued to take an active part in social work and civic affairs. She was Vice President and Director of the East Side Settlement House from 1939 to 1943. During World War II Mrs. Lord was Assistant Director of Civilian Defense in the New York area as well as National Chairman of the Civilian Advisory Committee for the Women's Army Corps. At the present time, besides directing the entire women's campaign for Dwight D. Eisenhower, she is Chairman of the U. S. Committee for the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, President of the National Health Council, and a member of the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Service.

MRS. INDIA EDWARDS—Vice Chairman, Democratic National Committee and Director, Women's Division. Born in Chicago, India Edwards spent her early childhood in Nashville, Tennessee, and was educated in St. Louis, Mo. She worked on the Chicago Tribune for twenty-two years, first as a cub reporter and later as society editor (1918-36) and woman's page editor (1935-42). Mrs. Edwards came to the Democratic National Committee in Washington as a volunteer in the 1944 campaign to work in the publicity and radio division. She was appointed Executive Secretary of the Women's Division in March, 1945, and Associate Director in February, 1947. In 1948 she was appointed Executive Director of the Division, and two years later was elected Vice Chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Mrs. Edwards was the only woman in the U. S. Delegation to the Fourth World Health Organization Assembly in Geneva in 1951. She is a member of the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Service.

Moderator—JAMES F. MURRAY, JR.—Attorney, Author, Lecturer.

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by The Town Hall, Inc., New York 36, New York. **Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, New York 36, N.Y.**

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); eight weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 15c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright, 1952, BY THE TOWN HALL, INC.

Why Change?

Announcer:

This week our broadcast is coming to you from the birthplace of America's Town Meeting, the famed Town Hall in New York City. We are here in conjunction with the Town Hall lecture division, marking the first such program partnership in our history. Many times the question has been asked, "Exactly what is Town Hall?" Briefly, Town Hall is a clearing house of ideas. Its lecture and short course division present a varied and stimulating program each year from October until April—free morning lecture series and late afternoon courses in politics, mental health, economics, music, travel and other social and cultural fields.

Today in a large and complex community, the basic goal of Town Hall remains, to present facts and opinions on all sides of debatable questions so that the listener may with an open mind form, change or confirm his own opinions. And now to preside over our discussion, here is your moderator, author, lecturer and attorney, Mr. James J. Murray, Jr.

Mr. Murray:

Shortly after his nomination last July, Governor Adlai Stevenson of Illinois predicted that one of the most formidable obstacles he would have to overcome in his quest for the White House was the feeling that after 20 years of Democratic administration it might well be time for a change. Now, as the presidential race enters the crucial month of October, both parties appear to agree that this issue is indeed uppermost in the minds of the electorate, particularly the independent voters. Here now, to start, in Town Hall to discuss the

question "Why Change?" are two distinguished women representing the viewpoints of both political parties. But before presenting our guests this evening, I would like first to introduce the director of Town Hall, Dr. Thurston J. Davies.

Dr. Davies:

This fall, Town Hall enters its 29th season of bringing noted spokesmen from the field of politics, social relations, science and arts to its lecture platform. We are happy to welcome the old friends and newcomers to this hall, as well as members of the radio audience, to a special preview of our 1952-53 lecture program. In this tense pre-election period we felt that departure from our usual procedure of presenting a single speaker was not only warranted, but most desirable.

The regularly scheduled lectures at Town Hall will begin their season on Wednesday, November 5, at which time there will be an appraisal of the important returns of the day before. Thereafter, lectures will be offered here each Saturday, Monday and Wednesday mornings with such names as Dr. Ralph Bunche, Agnes de Mille, Mr. Ellis Arnall and Ambassador Spender of Australia on the roster. To all those living or visiting in the New York area we extend a hearty invitation to come in and acquaint yourselves with these and other activities in which Town Hall is engaged. And now I return you to your moderator, Mr. Murray.

Moderator Murray:

Thank you, Dr. Davies. Now to our guests. First, espousing the Republican viewpoint which advocates a change next November, the co-chairman of the National Com-

mittee of Citizens for Eisenhower, Mrs. Oswald B. Lord. Mrs. Lord, why change?

Mrs. Lord:

Espousing the viewpoint of the American people — the American people want new management. All over America, citizens are needing the machinery and setting the machinery in motion for a sweeping change of top management and key personnel in this country which they own and should be running. We are told ardently that we do not need a change or that Mr. Stevenson will provide us the needed change. These conflicting promises do not mean anything anymore. The Americans are sick of the confusion, blunders, gross misconduct and callous disregard of decency. We want a real change. We want a leader who is above reproach, who will carry out these changes.

We have heard the official ballyhoo about high employment and high wages so many times now that we are no longer confused by the false premises upon which these arguments are based. We've heard pronouncements on the idealistic goals of the administration so many times that they will only serve to cover up the actual presence of graft, corruption, and dishonest operation. We want democracy but we don't want communism. We want to live in a durable peace honorably attained. We want prosperity but we don't want corruption. I've been traveling across the country while whistle-stopping and mixing and talking with the people from the farms, the cities and the factories. They're beginning to see through this Democratic fog.

High employment — an impartial survey by Brookings Institute clearly shows that there never has

been a net increase in employment while the Democrats have been in power except in war-time. High wages—the facts are that in 1950 the average American family spent 400 dollars more than it made and has been going into the red ever since. Depression — Hoover just isn't running any more. And Eisenhower would have hardly been an acceptable candidate to the Hoover Republicans of 1928.

This dead issue hardly seems pertinent today. Isolationism—this charge cannot be leveled against the man who has had more experience in international problems than any other man in the world. The Democrats may take the credit for NATO, but Eisenhower is the man who made it work, the man who represents world co-operation and unity at its most advanced level. The Democratic record—we maintain that the record of gains made by the American people is nothing more than the normal progress our country would and should have made in the last 20 years regardless of what party the President was nominated by. This accounts for our increases in natural productivity, as well as the gains made by organized labor in paid pensions and vacations.

There are no Republicans that I know of who are against social security, collective bargaining or vacations. Not even the most reactionary Republican is against Christmas. The great British Empire had the same amount of growth for 300 years and has been finally brought to a dead stop only because a creeping socialism which began there 50 years ago was finally allowed to get a strangle hold.

World War III—this is the subject that Democrats skim over lightly, but it is probably the most

important issue we have to face today. We frankly don't like the current situation in Korea; we are not willing to take a chance of that happening in Europe. It would be the end of all of us. This problem is so urgent, so important and so vital that we know of only one man who can safeguard us, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

These are our reasons for objecting to the Democratic arguments and why we reject the illusions of security, safety and comfort they would like us to swallow. We object to their results, their method, their reasoning and their propaganda techniques. We are not satisfied with things the way they are. We feel strongly that every man here is in great peril. We are for change now before it is too late. (*Applause*)

Moderator Murray:

Thank you, Mrs. Lord. And now for what will undoubtedly be a completely contradictory opinion, Mrs. India Edwards, Vice Chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Mrs. Edwards:

I'm glad to see that I have some friends here, too, or rather that the Democratic party has some friends. When the Republicans say it's time for a change they hope that the voters will confuse the words change and progress. They hope the voters will think a change always means a change for the better. But the voters of this country are too intelligent.

They will not be sold on the idea of changing the party that during the last 20 years has spurred the change from a nation of depression and insecurity to a nation of prosperity and opportunity; from special deals for a few toward a fair deal for all; from isolationism, that wrecked the League of

Nations, to the United Nations and collective resistance to aggression. Democrats are for continuing progress; change if you will, but a change for the better; a change that will give our people still better living standards, a more peaceful world and a more abundant democracy.

The Republican standard bearers, the five-star General and young Lochinvar from the West are offering change for the sake of change. They are not boasting of the Republican record during the two years their party was in control of the Congress. They are not even standing on the Republican platform written in Chicago last July. Of course this is understandable, for neither the record of the Republican controlled 80th Congress nor the 1952 Republican platform offers much hope for the future to the American people.

But other Republican leaders, notably the Senator who won the battle of Morningside Heights and so became the strategist who is leading the assault on the White House, are bragging of the record of the do-nothing 80th Congress, which President Truman attacked so potently four years ago and which the voters repudiated in the election of 1948. This Senator, who was defeated by the General for the Presidential nomination in Chicago last July, had lost three previous battles for the Republican nomination for President, but by winning the battle of Morningside Heights just a few short weeks ago he achieved a position of leadership that makes the voters wonder if a change of party now would not mean the same sort of change they got when the 80th Congress was in control. (*Applause*)

That Congress, the people will remember, cut a million people from Social Security protection, cut

farm price supports, soil conservation, credit for small farmers and crop storage facilities; passed the Taft-Hartley Act; refused higher minimum wages; passed a rich man's tax bill, passed the real estate lobby's housing bill; raised rents; cut public power in the West and the TVA region, cut the school lunch program and discriminated against Catholic and Jewish displaced persons.

The Democratic candidate for the presidency this year, Adlai E. Stevenson, has said and I quote: "We believe in the power and right of peaceful, continuous change for the better." I would be perfectly willing to have the outcome of this election decided on these questions: Which party best understands the meaning of change in the modern world? Which party has ignored it? Which has anticipated the need for change and done something about it? Which party has resisted about every important change for the past 25 years? And looking ahead now, which party is most likely to cope effectively with the vast changes already in the making? (Applause)

Moderator Murray:

Thank you, Mrs. Edwards. And there, ladies and gentlemen, you have the battle lines drawn with the general statements of position representing the pro and con of *Why Change*. But as you may have noticed, while Mrs. Edwards and Mrs. Lord were discussing the broader aspects of *Why Change*, the word change itself appeared to be subject to several various meanings.

I wonder, Mrs. Lord, whether or not in your examination of just what the Republican party means when they say it is time for a change if you came across the editorial on September 27 in the *St.*

Louis Post Dispatch which while endorsing Governor Stevenson apparently used the terminology *it's time for a change* in his favor when they said the change which Stevenson and his independents foretell is clearly to be preferred over the change which is promised by the conflicting compromisers that surround and advise General Eisenhower? Now I wonder, Mrs. Lord, if you would care to comment on that statement?

Mrs. Lord: Well, I would like to comment on it by pointing out certain things that General Eisenhower has pointed out which to me seem a change for the better, and I hope we'll have time to come back to some other points that Mrs. Edwards brought up in her speech. Let's go over some of these changes that the Republican party would like to make.

First of all, the administrative change—General Eisenhower said he was in favor of carrying out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on government reorganization. And he'd go further and support a study to see if some federal functions could be returned to the states. Changes in agricultural policy—well, General Eisenhower has personally pledged the establishment of a bi-partisan agricultural commission with power to review the policies and the administration of our farm program. I won't go into details of that because that's been spelled out very carefully.

There would first be established a real foreign policy under General Eisenhower, not a makeshift one as there is now, one based on enlightened self-interest. The General has said that we should not commit ourselves to geographical lines or tie ourselves down in any way. This means more foreign policy balance and not one way in

one area, and it's plain to everyone who can hear or read that Eisenhower is for international co-operation as Mr. Co-operation himself.

Under administration, I think we do need an administration the people can trust, run by men and women in whose honesty, loyalty, and integrity they have faith. I won't go into the budget now, into the fact that approximately 75% of our budget is for military spending, and we know from General Eisenhower's experience and from what he said in detail the other night that he has had unique experience in military defense organization and above all men would be the person to make savings in that budget, because we must not risk our safety, but we must get our dollars' worth in that particular area.

Mr. Murray: Well may I ask Mrs. Edwards, do you think that this *time for a change* phrase is just an election year slogan designed to get votes or do you feel that there is any merit to the argument that it represents a genuine and widespread desire for a change based on dissatisfaction or weariness with the present administration?

Mrs. Edwards: Well, of course I think it's an election year slogan and I can well understand why the Republicans have adopted it because the only way that they can possibly hope to win would be if they could persuade the American people that it is time for a change, because they have nothing else to offer. When Mrs. Lord talks, for instance, about the Republicans' supporting the reorganization plan I wonder if she is not aware of the voting record of the Republicans in the Congress.

Mr. Murray: Are you aware of that, Mrs. Lord?

Mrs. Lord: Yes.

Mrs. Edwards: There are a great many of the reorganization plans that have been presented, and some have been passed but a great number have not been passed, and the record will show that it was the Republicans who voted against it. I, for instance, I would like to remark about what Mrs. Lord said—that the American people want new management. Well, that would be like saying that you brought in some new people to manage a bankrupt concern and after they got it going and it really was successful and paying big dividends to the stockholders then you would say, "Now let's throw out that management and let's try the people who ran it into bankruptcy. Let's bring them back and give them a chance and see what they can do." (*Applause*)

Mr. Murray: Would you care to tell us, Mrs. Lord, in your opinion then what changes the Republican party would venture to make?

Mrs. Lord: I thought I had gone over the changes and if you want to go into them more, I will, but I'm a little bit tired of this talk of we've never had it so good and giving the Democratic party credit for everything. (*Applause*) We heard a lot of talk about the big lie, and Hitler always said if it was big enough and repeated often enough it would become the truth in the minds of the public. I've seen it happen here and I think the big lie in our generation is the lie that one political party, and not American industry and labor, is responsible for the great production which makes the nation the wealthiest in the world.

What creates this wealth? Why, it's the farmer, and the laborer, and

the inventive genius, and the know-how of management. If the socialist state could produce these we never would have had to help Russia, with all they had during the war, with all the people and the land they had. Now we Americans, with our heritage of the American way of life, we make our own prosperity. It is not and never has been, I don't think, the gift of any one group. It's not prosperity because, but in spite of, the Democratic party. (*Applause*)

Mrs. Edwards: Now, of course I don't believe that anyone of the Democratic leaders claims that the unprecedented prosperity that American people are enjoying today is the result *only* of the Administration that has been in Washington for the last 20 years. We know that it is the American people working with the government, though. It has been because we have had in Washington a government that is concerned with all the people, not just with a few. (*Applause*) Now Mrs. Lord said something in her opening statement that I hope you will all remember. She said, which is absolutely true today, that the prosperity of today is taken for granted. Everybody has so much money in spite of the high taxes that they have today—everybody.

The money is more evenly divided. You go through the country, I'm sure Mrs. Lord has seen it as I have seen it going through the country, the hundreds and thousands of small homes in which working people live many of which have television antennas. If you would go into those homes you would find that most of them have electric washing machines to lessen the load for women. You should go through the farm districts and see what the farm wives have to

day, what the farmers have, and then consult the Republican voting record on rural electrification—how they have voted against it time and time again. Every one of these advances that have been made—social security—all of the things that have been the . . .

Mrs. Lord: I told you earlier what the Republican 80th Congress did.

Mr. Murray: Mrs. Lord is straining at the leash here, Mrs. Edwards, to reply.

Mrs. Lord: Just to quickly answer, I don't think many of these gains, including social security, could have been done by the Democratic party alone. But talking about money and going through the country, I did mention the fact of the average family today being in debt, but this is the actual size of a dollar today and this is the way the dollar has shrunk in the last 12 years. (*Applause*) I'll be very honest with you, the thing that worries me is will the savings of the people — their insurance, their social security and their pensions—have to be paid off in those ever-shrinking donkey dollars. That's what worries me.

Mr. Murray: I think we might point out for the benefit of our radio audience that the dollar equivalent which Mrs. Lord holds up is roughly about one-third the size of a normal dollar bill. Would that be fair?

Mrs. Edwards: Well, it wouldn't be fair, it wouldn't be accurate if she said that the dollar today is worth only one-third what it was 20 years ago. That would be inaccurate. No Democrat would deny that the value of the dollar is less today than it was 20 years ago, but the point is that there are more people who have dollars today. There were very few who had a dollar 20 years ago. (*Applause*)

Mrs. Lord: I would like to . . . Could I just answer that, India? The figures show that in 1938 there were 10 million people unemployed and in 1938 the Democratic party had been in power for awhile. Do you think that the party in power—you say in referring to the depression which I thought was a dead issue but it's here—do you think that the party in power is responsible, do you think the Republicans were responsible for the depression?

Mrs. Edwards: I think in large part the Republicans who were in power in the twenties were responsible for the depression. Yes, that's so.

Mrs. Lord: If the party in power is completely responsible, would you go along then and say that the Democratic party is completely responsible for World War I, World War II and the Korean War? (*Applause*)

Mrs. Edwards: Now, Mrs. Lord, I didn't say that the Republicans were completely responsible; I said they were partly responsible. It was the philosophy of government in the 1920's that I think was in large part responsible, but that depression was also part of a worldwide movement; it was not altogether. No, I certainly would not say for one minute that the Democrats were responsible for any war in which we've been engaged. I think the Democrats did everything they could to prepare us for the first World War and if we had been in the League of Nations, who can say whether that war would have taken place? It might well have been prevented and it was certainly the Republicans who kept us from being in the League of Nations. (*Applause*)

Mrs. Lord: I would just as soon go back and discuss those economic

questions, but I thought we were talking about the issues today and discussing what was going on today and what . . .

Mrs. Edwards: Mrs. Lord, all of what is happening today is largely a result of what happened in the past. We can only look to the future. We must concern ourselves mainly with the present but we do have to go into the past in order to have a correct evaluation. At least that is my point of view.

Now that brings up something that I would like to quote that General Eisenhower said which I think throws light on that. He said that in the military when strategical principles conflict with the tactical, the tactical always goes, which means that long-term programs are not nearly so important as winning the next battle—namely, the November election. I don't go along with that and neither does our candidate, Governor Stevenson. Governor Stevenson has said that it is not important who wins this election but it is important that the American people should win. That is the important thing.

Mrs. Lord: I don't think I even have to answer that in following Eisenhower's whole career, how he has planned for the future and the fact that when he went into NATO people had great misgivings as to whether he could bring those people together and work with them, and his great ability of working with people, and planning for the future, and choosing the right kind of people.

I want to go back again to our main thing that we were discussing—a change—and I would like right now, if I may, to do some quoting too. Mrs. Edwards quoted from somebody who is well known to all of us today and I'd like to quote from someone too. "For one

reason or another even a wise and loved political party given a long tenure of office finally fails to express any longer the will of the people and when it does so fail to express the will of the people it ceases to be an effective instrument of party government. It is far better for such a political party, certainly better for the state, that it should be relegated to the role of critic and that the opposing political party should assume the ranks of government." Mr. Roosevelt, F. D. Roosevelt, said that during the 1932 campaign. (*Applause*)

Mr. Murray: Well, ladies, I think that last quotation brings us face to face with one phase of this problem which is certainly on the mind of the independent voter, and I wonder if either or both of you would care to comment on it. It is the determination on some sides and the doubt on the other that a Democratic victory, regardless of other issues, that a Democratic victory in November would actually threaten our basic two-party system in America. Now, would either of you two ladies care to comment on that possibility?

Mrs. Edwards: I would be glad to and I'm sure that Mary Lord would, too. I think it would be a very sad thing to feel that a party should be voted back into power just in order to keep it alive. To start with, the Republican party is very much alive. That was evidenced at its convention in Chicago. It also has a goodly number of Senators and Congressmen, too many in my estimation and more than it will have in the next term. It also has Governors. It has people out working for it, like Mary Lord whom I respect very much. I would really like to ask Mrs. Lord a question but maybe it wouldn't be proper.

Mr. Murray: I'd like to have it.

Mrs. Edwards: The Democratic party was out of power for a long time, practically from the Civil War until the time of Woodrow Wilson except for the two administrations of Grover Cleveland, but during that time we were working constantly to improve ourselves and we finally were able to offer the country Woodrow Wilson. I think that the Republican party might have been doing a good deal of that in the time it had been out of power since 1932 and then it wouldn't have had to go outside the Republican party in order to pick a leader. It admitted its complete bankruptcy when it had to pick a military man. It wasn't even sure what he was. (*Laughter*)

Mrs. Lord: I want to answer both questions quickly. A Democratic victory would not necessarily doom the Republican party, but it would spell economic disaster because of the arrogance and wild spending which would continue unchecked. That's why the 7,000 Citizens for Eisenhower Committees throughout the United States are geared to see that it doesn't happen and are fighting for country not party. And as for picking Eisenhower, I want to congratulate the Republican party on having picked an American. It had many men to choose from, but they picked, (*Applause*) they had many fine men to choose from but they picked a man that all Americans wanted and that the Democrats themselves had tried to get and would have liked to have. (*Applause*).

Mrs. Edwards: Not all Democrats, Mrs. Lord.

Mr. Murray: It is time for the question period where the members of the audience direct their questions toward our distinguished guests today.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Lady: My question is addressed to Mrs. India Edwards. Do you not hold the Democratic members of the 80th Congress as culpable as the Republican members for the failure of the 80th, do-nothing, Congress?

Mrs. Edwards: Well, no, I don't. There were a few perhaps who voted with the Republicans, but the Republicans were in control at that time and it was their voting that kept a great deal of the legislation from being passed. I think it was quite evident that the farmers in the Middle West and all over the country certainly blamed the Republicans for what happened in the 80th Congress. No. To that I answer definitely no.

Lady: Mrs. Lord and Mrs. Edwards, do you think it is undignified for a President to campaign for any candidate? (*Applause*)

Mrs. Lord: Well, I frankly don't like to see President Truman away from his desk at this particular time, (*applause*) where he as an elected President should be, especially with the times the way they are. And how can anyone think that Stevenson wouldn't have a debt if he was elected? Because after all Truman is out working for Stevenson, but I do wish that Mr. Truman was at his desk at the White House. (*Applause*)

Mrs. Edwards: Well, thank you, Mrs. Lord. I'm very glad that you feel that President Truman is such a good President that you want him there at his desk. I wasn't sure that you did. Personally, I think that President Truman owes it to his party and to the candidate who is now running to get out and campaign. He is still a tremendously popular man with the people and

it is a fine thing . . . I see no difference really between that, because President Truman is finished with public life. He wants nothing more than the American people can give him.

Mr. Murray: Now I see a question from the balcony.

Lady: Mrs. Lord, since Abraham Lincoln, a Republican, resorted to humor during his campaign, why do Republicans object to Stevenson's humor since the serious element is always present?

Mrs. Lord: First of all, I haven't heard anyone come right out and object to humor. I've heard people come out and say that at this serious time we should be discussing the issues with seriousness, with sincerity, and not fill our speeches with flip remarks that might not have anything to do with the issues. I was very glad to see that Mr. Stevenson in his talk last night has given up quips and is talking in a very serious vein, too.

Mrs. Edwards: I should like to comment on that, too, if I may, please. Adlai Stevenson could no more give up making witty remarks than he could give up breathing. It's part of his character. Last night he made a very serious talk and I don't think there was any humor in it, but the humor that has crept into his speeches around the country has not in any way kept him from discussing the serious things. Every speech he has made has been a serious speech and he has presented an issue, which is more than I can say . . . I hate to attack a man who has been a great military hero, but we have yet to know how he stands on any question except the farm question and there he stands just where we stand. All we

know is what Senator Taft has said — that General Eisenhower agrees with him. (*Applause*)

Mr. Murray: Now, every week on Town Meeting we ask a question which has been submitted in advance by one of our listeners and we want to thank you for the many questions which you have submitted for this discussion. The listener who sends us the most appropriate question in the opinion of our program staff receives a 20 volume set of the American People's Encyclopedia, an up-to-date reference with all 20 volumes beautifully bound in Moroccan leather.

To participate in our Town Meeting discussion, all you need do is send us a question pertinent to the following week's subject. Please keep it within 25 words and mail it to Town Meeting Questions, New York 36, New York. At the close of tonight's program we will tell you about our subject for next Tuesday, and we hope that you will submit a question for our discussion. Now this week, Mrs. Byron Webb, 84 Penataquit Ave., Bay Shore, Long Island, receives a set of the American People's Encyclopedia for sending the following question: "Is there any fundamental difference in the platforms of the Republican and Democratic parties which would justify a change?" Mrs. Lord, would you care to give the first reply?

Mrs. Lord: I was told to keep it brief and I haven't got both platforms in front of me but there are some fundamental differences in both platforms. I notice, however, and I know that Stevenson is running on the Truman administration platform; Eisenhower is running on the Republican platform, but everyone knows that platforms are shaped and that leaders take those

platforms and interpret them in the way that they wish to interpret them.

However, Eisenhower is sticking straight to the Republican platform in the statements made in the Republican platform about Korea, and there are two articles in the morning paper about Korea. He is sticking to the Republican platform on civil rights, and I know of no one who can take Eisenhower's place when it comes to human values and knowing human values. He's sticking to the Republican platform on corruption in government, on communism, and I refer you to Bedell Smith's speech this morning, and he was sticking to the Republican platform on the agricultural and on the foreign policy, as well.

Mr. Murray: Well, Mrs. Edwards, do you believe that there are any fundamental differences in the platforms which would justify a change?

Mrs. Edwards: Well, it seems to me that after a very careful study of both platforms that they are completely unlike, and any American who thinks they are alike must be a great cynic. Our candidate is running on the Democratic platform written by all the Democrats, all factions of the Democrats.

For one thing just let me point out a few differences in it. The Republican platform never mentions the words child welfare. It never mentions anywhere anything about atomic energy except when it talks about bombs. We have a portion about atomic energy in which we look forward to the time when atomic energy will be used for constructive purposes to preserve life rather than to destroy it. There is nothing in the Republican platform about a number of things

that are of tremendous interest to the American people.

Mr. Murray: Well, obviously both of you ladies could expound at considerable length but I do see some more questions from the audience, and I'd like to take the lady on the left.

Lady: Mrs. Lord, since our only estimate of how Republican control of the government would change it is based on the performance of the 80th Congress, do you base your appeal for change on that record and if so on what specific achievements of all the records?

Mrs. Lord: As a matter of fact there are a great many things the 80th Congress did that weren't so bad, but we haven't got time to go into that, such as reducing taxes and yet taking in more money during the 80th Congress than has ever been taken in before or since.

I also base my conviction of change on Eisenhower the man, on the people who are working with him, on his leadership qualities, on his experiences and what I know personally of having seen him do—not only during the war as a leader but also in NATO, also when he was at Columbia. I could go on and on on his abilities and the men who are working with him, and his leadership that he will have, and his ability to get along with people and look for areas of agreement among all people—not just Republicans but Democrats as well, instead of looking for areas of disagreement.

Mrs. Edwards: May I comment?

Mr. Murray: Well, I would like to get at the young lady in the center. We have time for perhaps one or two more questions.

Lady: This is addressed to Mrs. Edwards. Do you feel it an in-

fringement of human rights to expose the income of public officials?

Mrs. Edwards: No, I do not. I think that any man or woman who goes into public life should have nothing in his past or in his income tax return that couldn't be made available. May I now just comment on what Mrs. Lord said? I think that everyone in the United States, Democrat and Republican alike, felt that General Eisenhower was a man of high moral purpose. But *how* is he going to be able if he were elected to be President and follow those lines when he is supporting men like Jenner, a man who made the statement he made about General Marshall? That is a little bit too much of a compromise in my book.

Mr. Murray: Mrs. Lord, perhaps you'd like to answer that in about 25 seconds if you will.

Mrs. Lord: I'd like to answer in 25 seconds by saying let's look at some of the people that Stevenson's going to have to support. (*Applause*)

Mrs. Edwards: There is nobody he has to support that has done what Jenner has done.

Mrs. Lord: There is no totalitarian thought control of Eisenhower. He wants to get along with everyone and find areas of agreement and not areas of disagreement.

Mrs. Edwards: I don't think that's the kind of man the American people are going to want for President. They want a leader.

Mr. Murray: Well, thank you very much, Mrs. Edwards and Mrs. Lord, for your most interesting discussion of today's question. So plan to be with us next week and every week at the sound of the Crier's Bell.

FOR FURTHER STUDY OF THIS WEEK'S TOPIC

Background Questions

1. What is the reasoning behind the argument that it is time for a change in political parties?
 - a. Is this just an election year slogan designed to get votes?
 - b. Or, does it represent a genuine and widespread desire for a change based on dissatisfaction with the present administration?
2. To what extent is concern for the two-party system justified?
 - a. Will a Democratic victory threaten the two-party system?
 - b. Or, will a Democratic victory doom the Republican Party to extinction?
 - c. Does perpetuation of the two-party system necessarily require the perpetuation of the same two parties? Have we not had party realignments before in our history?
 - d. Is there any time span beyond which a party should not hold office? Or, does this depend on the party and the calibre of its leadership?
 - e. Should the Democratic Party be voted out of office regardless of issues?
3. Is there validity in the contention that only a Republican victory will save the Republican Party from its extremists?
4. Is there merit in the argument that the Democratic Party is the 'party of the present' in that it has a clearer understanding of current problems?
5. Is the contention that the United States has become a normally Democratic country correct?
6. Must the Republicans rely on dissatisfied Democrats and independents to win in November? Or, is Taft's assumption that a Republican victory depends on getting out the normally non-voting public correct?
7. Is there a large group of dissatisfied Democrats in the United States today? If so, why?
 - a. Has the Korean war stimulated dissatisfaction with the present administration?

-
- b. Are taxes and inflation the issues which may give the election to the Republicans?
 - c. Are Communism and "creeping socialism" valid issues, and how will they affect the electorate?
8. Has the corruption-in-government issue had much effect on the electorate? Or, has recent evidence of shady dealings in both parties blunted this charge against the present administration?
- a. Has evidence of corruption been limited to the Executive Branch of the government? Or, has the Legislature been equally culpable?
 - b. Has evidence of corruption been limited to one party? Or, have members of both parties engaged in unethical practices?
 - c. Is Governor Stevenson's contention that "guilt knows no party" correct?
 - d. Does public virtue and efficiency decline with tenure in office?
9. Are Governor Stevenson and General Eisenhower "captive" candidates? Or, are charges to that effect unjustified?
- a. Is there merit in the argument that General Eisenhower, despite his integrity and ability, cannot save the Republican Party from the isolationist Old Guard?
 - b. Is there merit in the argument that Governor Stevenson, despite his integrity and ability, cannot set his own house in order?
10. What changes would a Republican Party victory bring?
- a. What changes would be made in the administrative structure of our government?
 - b. What would become of the New Deal-Fair Deal legislation of the past twenty years?
 - c. Would there be any drastic changes in over-all farm policy?
 - d. What changes would be made in foreign policy? Would there be a shift in emphasis from Europe to Asia, from containment to liberation or isolation?

BEHIND THE CRIER'S BELL

With the first cool days of autumn and back-to-school for thousands of children throughout the nation, it's back "on the road" for America's Town Meeting.

On October 7th, the program will be coming to you from York, Pennsylvania, under auspices of York Junior College, a community college which has an enrollment of about 250. ABC's noted Washington news commentator Gunnar Back will be on hand to moderate this and the following week's discussion, marking his "debut" on Town Meeting. "Should the Taft-Hartley Act Be Repealed or Amended?" has been set as the York discussion topic with ex-Congressman Fred A. Hartley, Jr. and Robert Creasey, Assistant Secretary of Labor, set as speakers.

Traveling south for its next stop on the itinerary, Town Meeting will originate from Augusta, Georgia, on October 14th. Here the American Business Club is acting as host organization and all ticket proceeds from the broadcast will be used for the benefit of Augusta's Cerebral Palsy School.

Next month, in Joliet, Illinois, it's a 50th anniversary for the country's oldest public junior college. Town Meeting will be there on October 21st to join in the observation, coming as part of the Joliet High School and Junior College "World Today" series, planned for day students as well as adults in the evening Adult Education Division.

On October 28, the Town Crier will swing his bell in Riverdale, New York's P.S. 81, where we will be guests of the Riverdale Forum. This date, incidentally, marks an interesting new outlet for Town Meeting appearances—the subway circuit. Though located just outside of New York City, Riverdale citizens and some of their neighbors have become enthusiastic about bringing Town Meeting right into their community, rather than simply attending the broadcasts in Manhattan.

The month of November will also be spent on tour. No broadcast is scheduled for Election Night, November 4th, but on the following Tuesday, Town Meeting will be co-sponsored by Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Town Hall lectures and the Civic Forum of Troy, New York.

Still in a collegiate atmosphere, the program cuts over to New England on November 18th, with the Springfield, Massachusetts College Club to act as host organization. Winding up the month will be a broadcast from Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois, where we will be guests of the Campus Forum.